

Appl. No. 09/998,401  
Amdt. dated 11/12/2004  
Reply to Office Action of 08/13/2004

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the telephone interview of November 12, 2004. Claims 1 - 20 are pending in the present Application. In the above-identified Office Action, the Examiner instituted an election/restriction requirement because the claims in the Application constitute two distinct invention groups (i.e., Claims 1 - 4, 6 - 9, 11 - 14 and 16 - 19 make up one group and claims 5, 10, 15 and 20 make up the other group). Further, the Examiner objected to the ABSTRACT and to Claim 16. Claims 1 - 4, 6 - 9, 11 - 14 and 16 - 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Small et al.

In reviewing the SPECIFICATION, Applicants have found a typographical/grammatical error that has been corrected by an amendment. In addition to the amendment to the SPECIFICATION, Applicants have provided a new ABSTRACT to replace the current one.

During a telephone conversation with the Examiner on August 3, 2004, Applicants' attorney made a provisional election with traverse to prosecute the claimed invention as characterized by the first group of Claims (i.e., Claims 1 - 4, 6 - 9, 11 - 14 and 16 - 19). Consequently, Applicants have canceled Claims 5, 10, 15 and 20 from the Application.

In response to the §102(b) rejection of the claims, Applicants have amended independent Claims 1, 6, 11 and 16. Due to the amendment, Claims 2 - 4, 7 - 9, 12 - 14 and 17 - 19 have become superfluous and thus are canceled. Note  
AUS920010873US1

Appl. No. 09/998,401  
Amdt. dated 11/12/2004  
Reply to Office Action of 08/13/2004

that no new matter has been introduced by the amendment to the claims since there is ample support (for the amendment) on page 11, line 30 to page 12, line 20 of the SPECIFICATION. Further, Applicants have amended Claim 16 to correct the typographical error which prompted the technical objection made thereto.

For the reasons stated more fully below, Applicants submit that the claims, as presently drafted, are allowable over the applied reference. Hence, reconsideration, allowance and passage to issue are respectfully requested.

As stated in the SPECIFICATION, depending on circumstances and environments (e.g., work, home) in which a computer system (e.g., a laptop) is being used, some icons, background image, screen saver image etc. may not be appropriate for display. In such cases, a user may have to delete the offending items from the desktop or replace them with others. However, in some other environments (e.g., away from work or away from home) the user may want these items displayed. Presently, a user can only have one desktop be automatically displayed whenever a computer system is turned on. The present invention, however, allows different desktops to be displayed based on the network address of the computer system.

Particularly, the invention may be designed so a user may specify ahead of time that if a computer system is behind a company's firewall (e.g., is part of a company's Intranet) a particular desktop may be displayed. If not, a different desktop may be displayed. Whenever, the computer system is turned on, it will check to see whether it is

AUS920010873US1

Appl. No. 09/998,401  
Amdt. dated 11/12/2004  
Reply to Office Action of 08/13/2004

within the company's Intranet by comparing its network address which is made of an address assigned to a network and an address assigned to the computer system itself with a stored network address, which is also made of an address assigned to a network (network in this case is the network of the company) and an address assigned to a computer system. Based on the result of the comparison, an appropriate desktop may be used.

The invention is set forth in claims of varying scopes of which Claim 1 is illustrative.

1. A method of using a desktop upon turning on a computer system, the computer system having a network address consisting of an address assigned to a network and an address assigned to the computer system, the method comprising the steps of:

*determining whether more than one desktop exist on the computer system; and*

*selecting one of the desktops to use if more than one exist, said selecting step includes the step of comparing the address assigned to the network of the network address of the computer system with an address assigned to a network of a stored network address and the step of using the selected desktop if the two compared addresses are the same.*  
(Emphasis added.)

As mentioned before, Applicants submit that the claims, as presently drafted, are allowable over the applied reference.

Small et al. purport to disclose a time and location based computing. According to the teachings of Small et al.  
AUS920010873US1

Appl. No. 09/998,401  
Amdt. dated 11/12/2004  
Reply to Office Action of 08/13/2004

al., a plurality of beacons is used. Each beacon emits an identifier that may tell a computer system where it (the computer system) is located. That is, when a computer system (e.g., laptop, PDA etc.) is within range of a beacon, it will detect the identifier emitted by the beacon. Using the identifier, the computer system may determine its own location. Based on the computer's location as well as a calendar, the computer system may select a desktop to display.

In instances where a wireless connection is used to connect the computer system to an Intranet, for example, Small et al. teach that the part of the Intranet to which the computer system is connected may be used to determine the location of the computer system with some granularity. That is, Small et al. teach a method of determining where, within a company, a computer system may be located.


However, Small et al. do not teach, show or suggest a method of ***determining whether more than one desktop exist on a computer system*** and to select, if more than one desktop exist, one desktop by ***comparing the address assigned to a network of the network address of the computer system with the address assigned to a network of a stored network address and using the selected desktop if the two addresses are the same*** as claimed.

Consequently, Claim 1 should be allowable. Independent Claims 6, 11 and 16, which all incorporate the above-emboldened-italicized limitations in the above-reproduced claim 1, also be allowable. Therefore, Applicants once more respectfully request reconsideration,  
AUS920010873US1

Appl. No. 09/998,401  
Amdt. dated 11/12/2004  
Reply to Office Action of 08/13/2004

allowance and passage to issue of the claims in the  
application.

Respectfully submitted,  
Keohane et al.

By:   
Volet Emile  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 39,969  
(512) 306-7969

AUS920010873US1

Page 12 of 12